



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/921,938	08/02/2001	Ian Latchford	AMAT/4375/DD/BCVD/	8367

7590 05/06/2002

PATENT COUNSEL  
APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.  
Legal Affairs Department  
P.O. BOX 450A  
Santa Clara, CA 95052

EXAMINER

WALKE, AMANDA C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1752

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2002

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/921,938	LATCHFORD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Amanda C Walke	1752	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-7 and 36-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Babich et al (5,830,332) in view of Lin et al ((6,087,064).

Babich et al disclose a method of the sputter deposition of hydrogenated amorphous carbon film 1.

(a-C:H). The method includes putting a substrate into a deposition chamber, providing a mixture of a hydrocarbon gas, He, H, O, and Ar gas, and heating the mixture during the deposition process at 25 degrees C or optionally from 25 to 400 degrees C, at a pressure of 1-50 mTorr and a flow rate of 1-100 sccm (column 4, line 18-column 6, line 38). The target is held at a fixed dc bias voltage (from a dc power supply) of power density of 0.8 to 19.4 W/cm<sup>2</sup>. The preferred compounds for use as the hydrocarbon include methane, ethane, propane, butane, acetylene, and the like, but preferably contemplated are acetylene (claim 9), methane, and ethane. The a-C:H layer may absorb DUV (248 nm or 193 nm wavelength) light and have a refractive index of 1.6 and 2.2 and has a thickness of 500 to 5000 angstroms (column 2, lines 39-54, column 3, lines 29-42, column 7, lines 25-34). After depositing the layer on the substrate, a layer of photo resist may be applied thereon which is then exposed and developed. Then the a-C:H film is etched (RIE) with oxygen plasma, then the photo resist is removed. Alternatively, a thin metal layer may be

Art Unit: 1752

added prior to the addition of the photo resist layer (column 7, lines 5-19 and column 11, lines 2-29). There is no teaching of the preferred thickness of the layer of photo resist, however, from the drawings the layer of resist appears to be the same thickness as the amorphous carbon layer. Therefore the layer of resist may be 500 to 5,000 angstroms thick. From example 4 it appears that the layer of photo resist is spun onto the a-C:H film as required by claim 3. The films have very low reflectivity and will reduce the unwanted flare from the reticle/mask (column 7, lines 35-37). The reference fails to provide data on the absorption coefficient at wavelengths of less than 250 nm. The absorption coefficient of a material appears to be an inherent property of the material, and appears to be related to the refractive index. The reference material appears to be similar and meets the present claim limitations for the refractive index, thus it is the position of the examiner that the material would also inherently meet the limitation for the absorption coefficient. The specification teaches that after exposure to an oxygen based etchant the photo resist layer may be used as a hard mask layer to etch the underlying layers, then the patterned amorphous carbon layer may be used as a hard mask to etch the underlying material layer. The layer of photo resist is exposed to a laser to form a pattern and is developed. Then, the a-C:H layer is etched through the remaining portion of the photo resist layer by an oxygen etchant, which would form a hard mask of the outermost portions of the photo resist layer since these are the portions that would be exposed to the oxygen etchant. Then the photo resist layer is removed (see example 4). The reference fails to specify the preferred type of photo resist used in the method.

Lin et al disclose a silicon containing photoresist material containing between 5 and 10 % silicon. The reference further teaches that the use of a silicon containing resist provides the

Art Unit: 1752

advantages of being capable of transferring a pattern of high resolution and good image profile to the underlying layers (see column 10, lines 1-46).

Given the teaching of Lin et al, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare a device by the method of Babich et al using the silicon containing resist of Lin et al to increase the resolution of the formed pattern with reasonable expectation of achieving a material having superior optical properties at UV and DUV.

3. Claims 10-14, 16-26 and 30-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Babich et al in view of Lin et al and Mitani et al (6,191,463).

Babich et al and Lin et al have been discussed above, but fail to disclose a silicon oxide or nitride layer coated on the substrate prior to the deposition of the a-C:H layer.

Mitani et al disclose a method of forming a semiconductor device containing may consist of silicon oxide or silicon nitride by CVD. The use of the insulating layer improves the reliability of the material by decreasing the deterioration of the film (increasing the dielectric breakdown strength) (see column 2, lines 1-25 and 12, line 57 to column 13, line 5).

Given the teachings of Mitani et al it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare the material of Babich et al in view of Lin et al choosing the add an insulating layer of silicon oxide or silicon nitride as taught by Mitani et al to improve the reliability of the film with reasonable expectation of achieving a material having superior optical properties at UV and DUV.

4. Claims 8, 9, 43, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Babich et al in view of Lin et al and Yang et al (6,165,695).

Babich et al and Lin et al have been discussed above, but fail to teach the use of a layer of photo resist having a thickness of less than 500 angstroms.

Yang et al disclose a method of making a semiconductor device using an ultra-thin layer of photo resist. The layer of photo resist employed in the method has a thickness of 50 to 2000 angstroms (column 3, lines 20-45). These ultra-thin resists are preferable because the limited penetration depth of the shorter wavelengths of UV requires their use so that the entire depth of the resist layer can be exposed (column 1, lines 51-63).

Given the teaching that it is known to use a layer of photo resist having any thickness in the range of 50 to 2000 angstroms, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare the material of Babich et al in view of Lin et al and use a layer of photo resist having any thickness in the taught range, preferably at the smaller end of the range so that the entire depth of the resist can be accurately patterned by the UV light used in the method of Babich et al (including thickness of 250 angstroms or less as required by claims 8, 9, 43, and 44) with reasonable expectation of achieving a material having superior optical properties at UV and DUV.

5. Claims 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Babich et al in view of Lin et al, Mitani et al and in further view of Yang et al.

All references have been discussed above.

Given the teaching that it is known to use a layer of photo resist having any thickness in the range of 50 to 2000 angstroms, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare the material of Babich et al in view of Lin et al and Mitani et al and use a layer of photo resist having any thickness in the taught range, preferably at the smaller end of the range

so that the entire depth of the resist can be accurately patterned by the UV light used in the method of Babich et al (including thickness of 250 angstroms or less as required by claims 27 and 28) with reasonable expectation of achieving a material having superior optical properties at UV and DUV.

6. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Babich et al in view of Lin et al in further view of Sobczak (4,576,834).

Babich et al, Lin et al, et al have been discussed above.

Sobczak discloses a method of forming a device utilizing a oxygen RIE process. In the method of the reference, a layer of photo resist is deposited on a stack of layers coated on a substrate. The layer of resist is patterned to form an etch mask. Then the oxygen RIE process is performed which removes a portion of the photo resist in addition to removing/etching the underlying layers (which include oxide and nitride layers and a fluorocarbon layer). The reference teaches that it is known to etch the layers in a single sequence (column 6, lines 13-53).

Given the teachings of Sobczak that it is known to remove portions of the photo resist layer while etching the underlying layers during an oxygen RIE process, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare the material of Babich et al in view of Lin et al and removing/etching a portion of the photo resist mask layer while simultaneously etching the underlying layers with reasonable expectation of achieving a material having superior optical properties at UV and DUV.

7. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Babich et al in view of Lin et al and Mitani et al in further view of Sobczak.

All references have been discussed above.

Given the teachings of Sobczak that it is known to remove portions of the photo resist layer while etching the underlying layers during an oxygen RIE process, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare the material of Babich et al in view of Lin et al and Mitani et al and removing/etching a portion of the photo resist mask layer while simultaneously etching the underlying layers with reasonable expectation of achieving a material having superior optical properties at UV and DUV.

### *Conclusion*

8. Applicant's arguments filed 2/19/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant has argued that neither the Babich nor the Lin reference teach or suggest depositing a silicon containing resist layer on top of an amorphous carbon layer, then forming an in situ hard mask in an outer portion of the photo resist during an etching process through the amorphous carbon layer. Also, the applicant has argued that neither reference teaches one of ordinary skill in the art to expect the advantages expected of applicant's claimed method which would include the formation of the in situ hard mask. The steps of the Babich reference appear to be basically the same as those of the present claims. The a-C:H film is etched to form a pattern and then is used as a mask to etch the underlying layers. This appears to meet the present claim limitations. The Lin reference provides advantages to using its taught silicon containing resist in a pattern formation method, which provides one of ordinary skill in the art with motivation to use the resist of Lin in the method of Babich. With respect to applicant's argument that the references to not aim to solve the same problem or achieve the same advantages as the present

---



Art Unit: 1752

invention, the prima facie case of obviousness is not undermined simply because applicant's motivation for using a silicon containing resist in a pattern forming method differs from that of the prior art's motivation. In re Dillon, 919 F.2d 688, 692-93, 16 USPQ2d 1897, 1901 ( Fed. Cir. 1990) ( in banc ), cert. Denied, 500 U.S. 904 (1991).

Applicant has argued that Mitani fails to teach or suggest depositing a material layer on a substrate via CVD prior to depositing an amorphous carbon layer, nor does it teach the use of a silicon containing resist. Mitani is solely relied upon for its teaching of adding a silicon oxide or silicon nitride as an insulating film whose use improves the reliability of the material by decreasing the deterioration of the film. The reference does provide motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to employ an insulating film to achieve this advantage in a pattern forming method.

Applicant has argued that Yang fails to teach or suggest the use of a silicon containing resist on top of an amorphous carbon layer. The Yang reference is solely relied upon for its teaching of the suitable thickness for a layer or photo resist. The ultra-thin resist of Yang is beneficial because the limited penetration depth of the shorter wavelengths of UV requires their use so that the entire depth of the resist layer can be exposed which provides motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art for employing an ultra-thin resist.

Applicant has argued that claims 15 and 29 depend from claims that have already been discussed and should be allowable. Because of the reasons cited above, the examiner maintains her position and claims 1-44 remain rejected.

*Conclusion*

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amanda C Walke whose telephone number is 703-305-0407. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 5:30-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Baxter can be reached on 703-308-2303. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9792 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Application/Control Number: 09/921,938

Page 10

Art Unit: 1752



Amanda C Walke  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1752



May 6, 2002

ROSEMARY ASHTON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER